

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-8 are pending, Claims 1-5 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new Claims 6-8 having been added by way of the present amendment.

Support for Claims 6-8 is found throughout the specification and in the figures (see, e.g., Figures 2 and 3) and therefore no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 were rejected as being anticipated by Jalloul et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,440,317, hereinafter “Jalloul”); Claim 3 was rejected as being unpatentable over Jalloul in view of Yamamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,906,677, hereinafter “Yamamoto”); Claim 4 was rejected as being unpatentable over Jalloul in view of Chen (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0024474, hereinafter Chen); and Claim 5 was rejected as being unpatentable over Jalloul in view of Chen and Yamamoto.

Claim 1 was drafted with “means plus function” language and has therefore been canceled. New Claim 6 has been drafted to avoid a claim construction under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph. Furthermore, the feature contained in dependent Claim 3 is now included in independent Claim 6. In particular, Claim 6 is directed to a portable wireless apparatus that includes a conductor board including at least a circuit board (see, e.g., Figure 3). The apparatus also includes a box-shaped shield member having an electrical length about half that of the conductor board. The shield member also includes an opening and a top thereof configured to receive the conductor board therein so that the shield member has an inside surface facing a surface of the conductor board, and a bottom of the conductor board is electrically connected to a bottom of the shield member. A feeding mechanism is configured to supply power to around a center of the conductor and at the top of the box-shaped shield member. Once again, in a non-limiting example, see Figure 3 is a non-limiting example.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Jalloul in view of Yamamoto taught or suggested all the features of Claim 3. The outstanding Office Action recognizes in paragraph 6 for example that Jalloul and Chen do not recite a shield case with an opening at the top. Rather, paragraph 5 of the Office Action, refers to Yamamoto as including a second radiating means (referring to Figure 1A) that is a box with an opening. However, the box disclosed in Yamamoto has a different structure than that defined by new Claim 6. In particular, Claim 6 defines a box-shaped shield member having an electric length about half that of the conductor board. As shown in Figure 1A and 1B in Yamamoto, Yamamoto does not disclose such a structure especially in view of the large ground conductor 11. Furthermore, Claim 6 requires an opening at the top of the shield member to receive the conductor board so that the shield member has an inside surface that faces a surface of the conductor board. Furthermore, Claim 6 requires a feeding mechanism configured to supply power to around a center of the conductor and at the top of the box-shaped shield member. As shown in Figures 1A and 1B of Yamamoto, Yamamoto is directed to a different structure that does not contain the features of new Claim 6. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that no matter how Jalloul is combined with Yamamoto, the combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of new Claim 6. Because Claims 7 and 8 depend from new Claim 6, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 7 and 8 also patentably define over the asserted prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073